



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/865,419	05/28/1997	STEPHEN B. AUGER	CLINK0002	8405

7590

04/03/2002

JAMES C. WRAY
1493 CHAIN BRIDGE ROAD
SUITE 300
MCLEAN, VA 22101

EXAMINER

EINSMANN, MARGARET V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1751

DATE MAILED: 04/03/2002

38

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliance
With 37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Application No.

08/865,419

Applicant(s)

AUGER, STEPHEN B.

Examiner

Margaret Einsmann

Art Unit

1751

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on _____ is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192 (c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENTIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. ☐ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. ☐ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
 - (a) ☐ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
 - (b) ☒ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c) (7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. ☐ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. ☒ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

In response to applicant's appeal brief, the examiner acknowledges that claims 23, 25, 26 and 29 were canceled in the amendment received May 2, 2000.

In response to the request for a correct copy of claims 1-3, 20-22 and 31, copies of said claims are attached to this notice Item 6b. Applicant has not presented reasons why the claims do not stand or fall together. Applicant misunderstands the examiner's remark in paper # 36. The examiner stated that applicant has merely pointed out the differences in what the claims cover and did not argue why each claim is separately patentable. Please read the quotation from the MPEP appended to paper #36. Applicant has to point out how each claim is patentable over each reference, not merely how the claims differ from each other.

Item 4. The summary of the invention is still not CONCISE.

Margaret Einsmann